UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,169	06/01/2005	Hiroshi Kashino	04558/095001	1116	
22511 OSHA LIANG	7590 09/04/200 L.L.P.	8	EXAMINER		
1221 MCKINN	EY STREET	SUITTE, BRYANT P			
SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX	X 77010	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1795		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
		10/537	,169	KASHINO ET AL.	KASHINO ET AL.			
		Examir	ner	Art Unit				
		BRYAN	IT SUITTE	1795				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on	the cover sheet v	with the correspondence ac	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
	Responsive to communication(s) file	nd on 14 July 2008						
2a)□		2b)⊠ This action is						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
ت (۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
-								
-	I)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
		re withdrawn from	consideration.					
'=	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
•	Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or alactics	a raquirament					
اـــا(٥	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election	rrequirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 June 2005</u>	<u>5</u> is/are: a)⊠ acce	pted or b)□ obj	ected to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the drawing(s	s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/1/05, 7/21/05, 12/14/06, 5/3/07.  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:								



Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,169 Page 2

Art Unit: 1795

## POWER GENERATING ELEMENT FOR LIQUID FUEL CELL, METHOD FOR PRODUCING THE SAME, AND LIQUID FUEL CELL USING THE SAME

Examiner: Suitte 10/573,169 Art Unit: 1795 August 21, 2008

## Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, Claims 1-11 in the reply filed on July 14, 2008 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the application is a national phase 317 application, and the claims should be reviewed under unity of invention practice without regard to practice in national applications filed under 35 USC 111. This response is found persuasive and the restriction is removed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1795

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. (US 2004/0115502) in view of Takeuchi et al. (US 4,894,355).

Regarding claims 1, 10, 12 and 16, Fukuda discloses an electric power generating polymer electrolyte fuel cell comprising a cathode (2b) (reducing oxygen), an anode (2a) (oxidizing fuel) and a solid electrolyte disposed between the anode and cathode. See figure 1. Fukuda further discloses a catalyst layer comprising a pore diameter range from 0.1 to 1 µm. See paragraph 53. The catalyst is formulated by dispersing the catalyst layer in an organic solvent and then dried (removal of solvent) to formulate the catalyst layer particles (crushed particles). See paragraph 51. The method for producing a liquid fuel cell is disclosed above. Fukuda does not disclose a pore volume of the catalyst layer per se. However, it is the position of the examiner that the pore volume of the pore with respect to a total pore volume is inherent, given that the chemical composition of the electricity generating fuel cell disclosed by Fukuda and the instant application are similar. A reference which is silent about a claimed invention's features is inherently anticipatory if the missing feature is necessarily present in that which is described in the reference. Inherency is not established by probabilities or possibilities. *In re Robertson* 49 USPQ2d 1949 (1999).

Alternatively, the disclosure of Fukuda et al. differs from Applicant's claims in that Fukuda et al. do not disclose a pore volume of the pore is 4% or more with respect to a total pore volume. However, Fukuda et al. recognize the pore volume compared to the total pore volume is determined by the pore diameter size of a pore within the pore size range of 0.3 to 2.0 µm. See figures 3a, 3b, 6a, and 6b. Therefore, it would have been

within the skill of the ordinary artisan to adjust the size of the pore to yield a pore volume of the pore that is 4% or more with respect to total pore volume. *Discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art. In re Boesch*, CCPA 1980, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ215.

Furthermore, Fukuda does not disclose a thickness of the catalyst layers. Tanaka discloses a fuel cell comprising catalyst layers with a thickness range of 0.1 to 10000 μm. See paragraph 58. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a catalyst layer with a thickness range of 0.1 to 10000 μm as disclosed by Tanaka with the fuel cell of Fukuda because Tanaka teaches that a thickness smaller than 0.1 μm makes it difficult to withstand the pressure during cell production and that for fuel supply. See paragraph 58.

Regarding claims 2, 13 and 17, Fukuda discloses a catalyst layer comprises platinum or platinum-ruthenium alloy (catalyst). See paragraphs 52 and 65.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 18 and 19, Fukuda discloses carbon black (conductive material) supports a platinum-ruthenium alloy. See paragraph 65.

Regarding claim 5, Fukuda discloses an oxidation catalyst (4b) that is disposed between the cathode (2b) and the electrolyte (3). See figure 1.

Regarding claim 6, Fukuda discloses a fuel cell comprising polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) (insulating material) and Nafion (proton conductive material). See 56 and 65.

Regarding claim 7, Fukuda discloses a backing layer 5 comprising a two-layer structure (not shown in the figure) formulated with a layer of the carbon black and a

PTFE particle material. The backing layer supports the oxidation catalyst layer. See paragraph 57 and figure 1.

Regarding claim 8, Fukuda further discloses a catalyst layer comprising a pore diameter range from 0.1 to 1  $\mu m$ . See paragraph 55.

Regarding claim 9, Fukuda discloses an electric power generating fuel cell as recited above. However, Fukuda does not disclose a catalyst layer thickness.

Tanaka discloses a fuel cell comprising catalyst layers with a thickness range of 0.1 to 10000 µm. See paragraph 58. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a catalyst layer with a thickness range of 0.1 to 10000 µm as disclosed by Tanaka with the fuel cell of Fukuda because Tanaka teaches that a thickness smaller than 0.1 µm makes it difficult to withstand the pressure during cell production and that for fuel supply. See paragraph 58.

Regarding claim 11, Fukuda discloses a liquid fuel is a methanol solution. See paragraph 61.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYANT SUITTE whose telephone number is (571)270-3961. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dah-Wei Yuan can be reached on 571-272-1295. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,169 Page 6

Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BS

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795